



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,115	09/29/2006	Yoshiaki Nagara	5000-5263	2425
27123	7590	03/02/2009		
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			EXAMINER HOLLWEG, THOMAS A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/02/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOPatentCommunications@Morganfinnegan.com
Shopkins@Morganfinnegan.com
jmedina@Morganfinnegan.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/534,115

Applicant(s)

NAGARA ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas A. Hollweg

Art Unit

2879

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2879

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the prior art references, Fujita (U.S. Pat. 6,566,807) and Uchida (U.S. Pat. 6,376,694), do not teach, disclose, or suggest that the first organic compound is a silole derivative with $\geq 1\%$ and $\leq 50\%$ by weight of the total weight of the electron transport layer, either alone or in combination.

Fujita discloses an electron transport layer provided between a pair of electrodes, the electron transport layer including at least a first organic compound and a second organic compound, wherein the first organic compound is from 1% or more to 50% or less by weight of the total weight of the electron transport layer (col. 24, line 42 - col. 26, line 50). As applicant points out, Fujita does not expressly disclose that the first organic compound is a silole derivative. Uchida teaches a silole derivative that can be added to an electron transport layer to take advantage of the electric properties of the silole ring (col. 7, lines 10-26). This combination is motivated by the express teaching in Uchida that the silole derivative material may be used in an electron transport layer to improve efficiency and longevity of the device (col. 2, line 3 - col. 3, line 67).

Therefore, the combination of Fujita and Uchida teaches that the first organic compound is a silole derivative with $\geq 1\%$ and $\leq 50\%$ by weight of the total weight of the electron transport layer, and applicant's argument is not found to be persuasive.

Applicant further argues that even if a silole derivative is used for the first organic compound, the prior art does not teach the recited critical range (1% to 50%), nor does it recognize the unexpected results obtained.

The office action points to several examples given by Fujita (Comparative Examples 10-12 and Examples 22-24), which have the claimed ratio of first organic compound to second organic compound. Further, applicant's claimed range is extremely broad, covering nearly half of all the possible ratios of the two compounds. Therefore, applicant's critical range argument is also not found to be persuasive..